

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-85 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Office rejects claims 1-85 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office states:

Claims 1-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. Evidence that claims fail(s) to correspond in scope with that which applicant(s) regard as the invention can be found in the Appeal Brief filed 10/26/2005. In that paper, applicant has stated that the "anonymous identity" of the user is not same as alias (such as at page 13, the first paragraph) and that "contact directed to the anonymous identity of the user" is not same as selecting articles for a user to view (also at page 13), and these two statements indicate that the invention is different from what is defined in the claim(s) because the claims merely recite "anonymous identity." If an alias and a selective viewing for a user are not "anonymous identity", then claims fail(s) to correspond in scope with that which applicant(s) regard as the invention.

Until now, the phrase "anonymous identity" had been interpreted to be a mere alias to provide an anonymous identity (e.g., a screenname in an America On Line account). In such situation, an alias is used and articles or items are selectively handled for a user to view – thereby creating an anonymous identity. Clearly, Applicant does not mean this. What does Applicant mean?

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office's interpretation of Applicants' arguments presented in the Appeal Brief filed October 26, 2005 is incorrect.

Claim 1, which is representative of the other rejected independent claims 12, 14 and 25 with regard to similarly recited subject matter, reads as follows:

1. A method in a data processing system for an organization to provide anonymity to a user, the method comprising the data processing system implemented steps of:
 - receiving a request from the user for an anonymous identity;
 - generating the anonymous identity for the user, wherein the anonymous identity includes contact information for the organization;
 - associating the anonymous identity with the user, wherein the user uses the anonymous identity to provide information on a network data processing system;
 - receiving a contact directed to the anonymous identity; and
 - selectively forwarding the contact to the user based on a policy.

As to the Office's allegation that "applicant has stated that the "anonymous identity" of the user is not same as alias," Applicants' arguments on page 13, paragraph 1, of the Appeal Brief read as follows:

Appellants do not merely suggest that an alias is not an anonymous identity. Appellants respectfully submit that VeriSign describes configuring a server with an alias. VeriSign describes an administrator entering an alternative name for a server, such as an alias. VeriSign's server alias is not equivalent to receiving a request from a user for an anonymous identity for the user. Furthermore, VeriSign does not teach or suggest generating the anonymous identity for the user, wherein the anonymous identity includes contact information for the organization. In fact, only the administrator who is configuring the server generates the alias. VeriSign merely teaches storing the alias as an alternative name for the server and does not teach generating an anonymous identity for a user.

As stated in the first sentence, Applicants have not suggested that an alias is not an anonymous identity. Applicants respectfully submit that the applied VeriSign reference configures a server with an alias. The present claimed invention generates an anonymous identity for a user in response to receiving a request from the user for an anonymous identity. Applicants respectfully submit one of ordinary skill in the art would not equate generating an alias for a server to that of generating an anonymous identity for a user. Furthermore, VeriSign's configuration of the server with an alias is done by an administrator who assigns the alias. VeriSign does not receive a request from a user for an anonymous identity and then generate the anonymous identity for the user, wherein the anonymous identity includes contact information for the organization. VeriSign merely uses an alias name and nowhere in the VeriSign reference is any contact information for the organization included in the configuration of the VeriSign server with that alias.

Applicants further submit that VeriSign's teaching of assigning an alias to a server is to establish a more evident or useful name for the server so that users may more easily recognize the name of the server and access the server. One of ordinary skill in the art would not equate making accessibility to a server easier to that of generating an anonymous identity for a user, as in the present invention, is to hide the real-life identity of the user and, thus, making the identification of the real-life identity of the user more difficult to establish.

As to the Office's allegation that "contact directed to the anonymous identity of the user" is not same as selecting articles for a user to view," Applicants' arguments on page 13, paragraph 3, of the Appeal Brief read as follows:

Maltz is directed to selecting articles for a user to view by determining the value of the information contained in the article to the user. Maltz does not teach or suggest receiving a contact directed to the anonymous identity of a user and selectively forwarding the contact to the user based on a policy.

Applicants respectfully submit that a contact directed to the anonymous identity of the user may be but is not limited to an email or facsimile that is sent to the anonymous identity of the user. Thus, Maltz's teachings of selecting articles for a user to view by determining the value of the information contained in the article to the user would not be equivalent to an email or facsimile sent from a person which intends to contact another user through the use of an anonymous identity of the user.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-85 clearly set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. Therefore, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-85 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

II. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the prior art of record and is now in condition for allowance. The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE:

March 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Francis Lammes
Reg. No. 55,353
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Agent for Applicants